

REMARKS

This responds to the **August 28, 2009** Office Action.

In the Office Action, claims 111-114, 116-127, 129 and 131-138 are noted as pending in the application, claims 111-114, 116-120, 127, 129 and 131-134 stand rejected, no claims are objected to and no claims are allowed. Claims 121-126 and 135-138 have been withdrawn from consideration.

Applicants appreciate the review and discussion of Applicants' earlier response.

Applicants maintain the position that Enright fails to disclose the provision of live video signals. Examiner's focus is on the mention of capturing image and transaction data while virtually simultaneously delivering image and transaction data to a remote user. Applicant submits that it is clear from the context that Enright is simply talking about an ability to provide recorded video without disabling capture, hence facilitating maintaining the ATM in operation. Applicant reserves the right to continue this argument during subsequent prosecution.

However, in the interest of progressing this application to allowance, Applicant has amended claim 111. The following elements have been incorporated into Claim 111 to assist in further differentiating the inventions from the Enright reference:

- Each video server is configured for providing live video signals by multicast streaming such that only a single client computer can control the live video signals at a given point in time.
- Each video server is additionally configured for providing stored video signals by other than multicast streaming such that multiple client computers are able to view and control the same piece of stored video simultaneously without affecting each other.

Support is found in the PCT publication primarily at page 45, lines 7-15. Although this PCT extract does not recite word-for-word only a single client computer being able to control the live video signals at a given point in time, such is clear both in the context and from various references to camera control reservation throughout the specification. For example, Camera Control Reservation is discussed in part at Specification page 45,

lines 22-23, and the handling of camera control and reservation requests is discussed in part at Specification page 46, line 19, through page 47, line 2.

In overview, these recitations in claim 111 specify different technical approaches (resulting in associated functional ramifications) relating to the provision of live video versus recorded video. Note that:

- Live video is streamed by multicasting, and only one client has control over the live video. That is, although multiple clients can view the live video at any given time, only a single client has control over the live video (for example in terms of PTZ camera control).
- Recorded video is delivered other than by multicasting. This allows multiple clients to view and control the same piece of stored video simultaneously without affecting each other.

Enright is completely silent as to such functionalities. In particular, while Applicant maintains that Enright provides no live video (as previously noted), for whatever video it provides, Enright makes no mention as to how live video is provided to a client. Enright has merely a passing reference that by the interpretation presented in the Office Action suggests that live video functionalities may be available. As such, there can be no suggestion that Enright teaches such a differential handling approach thereby to allow distinct access and control behavioral characteristics for live and for recorded video.

Information Disclosure Statement

Applicants appreciate the indication that Applicant's Third Information Disclosure Statement has been considered and made of record.

Rejections

Claims 111-114, 116-120, 127, 129, 131, and 133 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Enright et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,583,813). Claim 132 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Enright et al. in view of Kuno (U.S. Patent No. 6,567,121). Claim 134 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Enright et al. in view of Dangi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,231,492).

These rejections are respectfully traversed in view of the foregoing amendments and the remarks herein.

Applicant's Disclosure

Applicant's disclosure has been discussed previously and that discussion will not be repeated here.

Cited Prior Art

The applied art has been discussed previously and that discussion will not be repeated here.

Claims

Consider now the claims in the application.

Claim 111 is an independent apparatus claim and recites in part:

“wherein each video server is configured for providing live video signals by multicast streaming such that only a single client computer can control the live video signals at a given point in time, and additionally configured for providing stored video signals by other than multicast streaming such that multiple client computers are able to view and control the same piece of stored video simultaneously without affecting each other.”

None of the applied references taken singly or in combination teach or suggest the claimed combination, the recited elements quoted above, or wherein each video server is configured for providing live video signals by multicast streaming such that only a single client computer can control the live video signals at a given point in time, or wherein each video server is configured for providing stored video signals by other than multicast streaming such that multiple client computers are able to view and control the same piece of stored video simultaneously without affecting each other. Enright, taken singly or in combination with the other applied references, teaches or suggests nothing about viewing live video, providing live video signals by multicast streaming such that only a single client computer can control the live video signals at a given point in time, or wherein each video server is configured for providing stored video signals by other than multicast streaming such that multiple client computers are able to view and control the same piece of stored video simultaneously without affecting each other. The other applied references fail supply the missing teachings.

Claims 112-114, 116-120, 129, and 131-134 are dependent directly or indirectly from independent claim 111 and are asserted as being patentable for the same reasons as discussed with respect to claim 111, for the combinations in the dependent claims as well as for the additional limitations recited in the dependent claims.

Reconsideration of the application and claims in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks is respectfully requested. Early notice of allowance thereof is earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner does not believe the foregoing amendments place the application in a condition for allowance, Applicants respectfully request the courtesy of a telephone interview to discuss the claims.

This response is being filed with payment for a Two-Month Extension of Time and a Request for Continued Prosecution.

Application No.: 10/049,449
Amendment dated: January 11, 2010
Reply to Office Action of: **August 28, 2009**
Atty. Ref.: 010100-109

The Director is hereby authorized to charge any fees under 37 CFR 1.16 and 1.17 which may be required by this paper to Deposit Account No. 50-0655. Please charge any omissions or deficiencies that may be due or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-0655.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 11, 2010

/James A Henricks/
James A. Henricks
Registration No. 31,168

HENRICKS, SLAVIN & HOLMES LLP
840 Apollo Street, Suite 200
El Segundo, CA 90245-4737
310-563-1456
310-563-1460 (fax)
jhenricks@hsh-iplaw.com (Email)